

REMARKS

In this Supplemental Response, Applicants amend Claims 1-5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, and 19-22. The amendments submitted herein replace all prior versions of the claims, including the version of June 22, 2007 submitted with an RCE. Claims 1-12 and 14-22 are currently pending. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 6, 12, 15, 16, and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,775,779 issued to England et al. ("England").

To anticipate a claim, the Examiner must show that a single reference teaches each of the elements of that claim. Applicants submit that England at least does not teach a processor that generates a signal to "cause the MCH to receive a bus transaction from a graphics device to enable access to the output data stored in the isolated output area in response to an indication of the signal that the output data is to be stored in the isolated output area of the system memory." England does not teach the interactions of the processor, the MCH, the isolated output area and the graphics device as recited in independent Claims 1, 12 and 19. More specifically, England does not teach the bus transaction received by the MCH in response to the signal generated by the processor. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at page 12, line 22 to page 13, line 12 of the specification.

England does not disclose a processor that issues a signal to cause a bus transaction to be received by an MCH. Rather, the system of England is a software system, which can be installed on any hardware platform run by any processor. England does not disclose the design of a processor. England also does not disclose a bus transaction between a graphics device and an MCH caused by a processor signal. Moreover, England does not disclose a processor that uses a processor signal to cause the graphics device to send a bus transaction to the MCH and to enable access to output data stored in an isolated output area. Thus, England does not teach each of the elements of amended Claims 1, 12 and 19.

In regard to Claims 6, 15, 16, and 20-22, these claims depend from Claims 1, 12, and 19, respectively and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned

above in regard to Claim 1, England does not anticipate these claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of Claims 1, 6, 12, 15, 16, and 19-22 are respectfully requested.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 2-5, 7-11, 14 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,775,779 issued to England et al. ("England").

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the relied upon references must teach or suggest every limitation of the claim such that the invention as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one skilled in the art. Claims 2-5, 7-11, 14 and 17 depend from Claims 1 and 12, respectively and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons mentioned above in regard to Claim 1, England does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these dependent claims.

With respect to Claim 17, England does not teach or suggest "occluding all windows but the first window." At page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner admits that England does not teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of Claims 2-5, 7-11, 14 and 17 are requested.

B. Claims 17 and 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over England in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,476,806 issued to Cunnif et al. ("Cunnif").

Claims 17 and 18 depend from Claim 12 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons mentioned above in regard to Claim 12, England does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims.

Cunnif does not cure the deficiencies of England. Cunnif does not disclose the processor and the bus transaction recited in base Claim 12. Furthermore, the Official Notice regarding the Windows style operating system is also totally unrelated to the process and the bus transaction recited in base Claim 12. Thus, England in view of Cunnif does not teach or suggest each of the elements of Claims 17 and 18.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of Claims 17 and 18 are requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: August 10, 2007




Jonathan S. Miller, Reg. No. 48,534

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below



Marilyn Bass August 10, 2007